directing your actions to success in your teleological striving towards goals ? *That is the teleological foundation of all science;* and scientists like Professor Hogben, who do not understand this simple truth, and profess to repudiate with pious horror all recognition of teleology, are simply revolving in a maze from which they can never escape so long as they persist in their wilful blindness. They are like a squirrel in a cage, always going but never getting anywhere.

Hogben's publicist standpoint is merely the behaviourists' repudiation of mind repeated in rather different words. Like Huxley's epiphenomenalism, it is really rooted in an overweening confidence in the adequacy of mechanical explanation in biology, and in failure to understand that other kinds of explanation are possible and perhaps necessary for any substantial progress. This comes out clearly when Hogben tells us that all proposals to reject mechanism in biology are defeatist formulae | a mistaken allegation which, in one form or another, is repeatedly hurled from the mechanist camp.

Hogben's repudiation, in the name of Science, of all private experience is the explicit advocacy of the great error of the science of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; the error of relying wholly upon sense-perception and neglecting the more private aspects of experience, experiences of activity, of striving, of effort, of emotion, of feeling, of desire; the error which, as Whitehead so clearly shows *(Life and Nature,* 1934), was

responsible for running Science into that backwater in which Hogben so proudly disports himself.

As regards the empirical justification of the mechanist position, Hogben lays chief stress upon the work on